

## **2022-23 State Coastal Conservancy ETC Grant Scoring Criteria**

- 1. Program serves participants from groups that consistently face barriers getting to or enjoying the coast (such as lower-income people/students, people with disabilities, English as a Second Language (ESL) communities, immigrant communities, at risk and foster youth, etc.) (10 points)**

10 – Approx. 90% fit 1 or more target groups  
8 – Approx. 80% fit 1 or more target groups  
6 – Approx. 70% fit 1 or more target groups  
4 – Approx. 60% fit 1 or more target groups  
2 – At least 50% fit 1 or more target groups  
Less than 50% = Ineligible

- 2. Project provides an enjoyable experience at the coast. (10 points)**

This criterion is about the participant's positive emotional experience at the coast and stems from ETC's theory of change – that the beach/coast has a power to bring joy and healing to people and that ETC wants to see that power shared broadly. A secondary outcome is that if people fall in love with the coast, they will want to protect it. Scoring an emotional experience is difficult. Things to consider when scoring this criterion: (a) To what extent are participants fully engaged versus being talked at; (b) do participants have choices about activities or open choice time; (c) do participants get to experience something new or unusual from their normal day to day activities; (d) are participants challenged to do something and supported so that they have success in doing it; (e) are activities appropriate for the participant community.

10 – Awesome  
8 – Very enjoyable  
6 – Enjoyable  
4 – Okay  
2 – Not very enjoyable

- 3. Project reduces economic, physical, or societal barriers for participants in accessing or enjoying the coast. Things to consider when scoring this criterion: (a) subsidized transportation; (b) subsidized costs or providing a scholarship program; (c) accommodations for people with varying physical abilities; (d) encouraging community representation at the coast. (5 points)**

5 – Project reduces identified barrier(s) in a way that will have long-term effect  
4 – Project reduces identified barriers during the coastal experience and may have long-term effect  
3 – Project reduces identified barriers during the coastal experience, but not likely beyond that  
1-2 – Project identifies barriers but is not designed to address or overcome them  
0 – Project does not reduce or address any coastal access barriers

**4. Project inspires ongoing coastal resource stewardship ethic through active learning and interactive activities. (5 points)**

5 – Project leaves participants educated on stewardship, as well as inspired and enabled to steward coastal resources in the future

3-4 – Project leaves participants educated and inspired to be coastal stewards, but they may not be enabled to do this in the future

1-2 One-off stewardship or environmental education experience that doesn't inspire or enable ongoing action

**5. Project is inclusive of all participants and considers differences in cultural and social backgrounds, past experiences, knowledge, comfort levels, etc. (5 points)**

4 - 5 – Project is inclusive of the community served; implements best practices.

3 – Project is inclusive of the community served but can be improved

1 -2 – Minimal consideration is given to the community served

0 – Project does not actively consider the community served

**6. Project serves participants with varying physical and/or cognitive capabilities. (5 points)**

5 – Project fully accommodates participants with varying physical and/or cognitive capabilities

4 – The main project components accommodate participants with varying physical and/or cognitive capabilities

3- Some project components accommodate participants with varying physical and/or cognitive capabilities

1 -2 – Minimal consideration is given to participants with varying physical and/or cognitive capabilities

0 – Project does not actively consider participants with varying physical and/or cognitive capabilities

**7. Overall long-term positive impact on participants. (10 points)**

Things to consider in scoring this criterion: (a) Increases comfort or right to be at the coast; (b) Participants gain a different understanding of themselves; (c) Encourages new abilities and potential to enjoy the coast; (d) Immersive and transformative experience; (e) Skills building; (f) Leadership development/job training; (g) Provides peer to peer mentorship; (h) Engages families or support systems; (i) Partners with other programs serving similar communities; (j) Project is or is a part of a multi-year/extended touch program; (k) other reasons explained in application.

9-10 – Project includes several of the scoring considerations listed above and having a long-term impact on participants is an explicit part of the programming.

7-8 – Project includes some of the scoring considerations listed above and will likely have a long-term impact on participants.

4-6 – Project may have a long-term impact on participants and includes a few of

the scoring considerations listed above

2-3 – Project may have short term impact but less likely to have a long-term impact.

0 -1 – Project unlikely to have a long-term impact

**8. Project applicant has the capacity to build and foster connections with the community served. (5 points)**

On a scale from 1-5, rate the applicant's ability to connect with the community served by the project. Qualities to consider for community-based capacity: (a) members of the community are involved in the project planning and/or implementation; (b) applicant's relationship with the community; (c) demonstration of appropriate and necessary partnerships for completion of the project; (d) staff reflects/relates with participants served and are culturally responsive to community needs, etc. The applicant's capacity with their target community can be built through other activities and doesn't only have to be through the Explore the Coast project they are applying for.

5 – Members of the community being served by the project are involved as board members, management staff, or have a leadership role in program development.

4 - Members of the community being served by the project are involved as non-management staff members, or volunteers, or participate with program development.

3 – Project is culturally responsive to community needs and applicant has already established appropriate and necessary partnerships within the community being served.

2 – Applicant intends to establish appropriate and necessary partnerships within the community being served.

0-1 – Little to no specifics provided on how to best serve the specific community being served

**9. Project applicant has appropriate methods and metrics to effectively evaluate project goals. (2 points)**

2 – Methods and metrics are great for measuring project goals; evaluation results will be used to improve future project programming

1 – Methods and metrics are ok for evaluating project goals

0 – No methods or metrics will be used to measure project goals

**10. Project description is clear. (5 points)**

- 5 – Great. The experience that participants will have is very clear; you have no questions
- 4 – Good. Pretty clear on participant experience with a few questions
- 2-3 – Fair. General gist of what participants will do but lots of questions
- 1 – Poor. Very little idea what will be done.
- 0 – Unclear proposal

**11. Overall project budget and/or specific task amounts funded by the grant is reasonable; cost per participant is reasonable given level of impact on each participant. (5 points)**

- 5 – Great, no concerns
- 4 – Good, minimal questions, can be resolved
- 3 – Pretty good, couple of questions
- 2 – Fair, need clarification
- 1 – Lots of concerns, not enough details
- 0 – Not comfortable with the budget/budget is not reasonable

**12. Project applicant has the capacity to carry out the project effectively and in a timely manner. (5 points)**

On a scale from 1-5, rate the applicant's capacity carry out the proposed project. Qualities to consider for demonstrated administrative capacity: a) staff expertise, b) organizational size relative to project budget, c) experience in administering grants of similar size, d) experience in implementing and completing similar projects, e) ability to adapt to changing circumstances due to COVID-19, etc.

- 5 – Great, no concerns
- 4 – Good, minimal questions, can be resolved
- 3 – Pretty good, couple of questions
- 2 – Fair, need clarification
- 1 – Lots of concerns, not enough details
- 0 – Not comfortable with applicant as grantee